



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/711,731

09/30/2004

Ricky Gene Braddy

2006579-0254 (CTX-123)

5730

69665

7590

01/06/2010

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC.
TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

LANIER, BENJAMIN E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2432

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/06/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant argues, “According to FIG. 2 of Wils, however, the flow chart clearly indicates that session determination (step 200) occurs before subscriber key verification (step 212)...” This argument is not persuasive because step 212 of figure 2 is not a subscriber **key** verification step as alleged by Applicant. Wils specifically discloses that if the session already exists, its handle will be found in the session database and the subscriber’s network access permissions ***will have already been established and verified*** and hence do not have to be reestablished ([0054]).

Therefore, it is clear that the access control decision is made prior to the session identification.

2. Applicant’s arguments with respect to the scenario in Wils where no sessions are identified is moot because it has been identified how Wils meets the claim limitations when sessions have been identified.

3. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2432

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 1-7, 9, 11-13, 18-24, 26, 28-33, 36, 38, 39, 42-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wils, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0004950, in view of Shrader, U.S. Patent No. 6,151,599. Referring to claims 1, 5-7, 9, 30, 36, Wils discloses a partitioning of network services among multiple subscribers such that when a subscriber requests a particular resource provided by a session ([0023]), a subscriber key is used to determine what the subscriber is permitted to access ([0026]-[0031]), which meets the limitation of requesting, by a client node operated by a user, access to a resource provided by an application session, gathering information about the client node in response to the request to access the resource, receiving, by a policy engine, the gathered information, making, by a policy engine, an access control decision for the resource based on application of a policy to the received information. The subscriber database and the session database are mapped in order to determine whether the subscriber is permitted to access the requested open session ([0030]-[0031]), which meets the limitation of identifying, based on the access control decision, an application session to which the client is permitted to connect, the application session from one or more application session already associated with the user and disconnected from one or more client nodes previously operated by the user. If the conditions for access to the open session are met, the subscriber is connected to

Art Unit: 2432

the open session ([0030]-[0031]), which meets the limitation of establishing, by a session server, a connection between the client node and the identified application session in response to the identification, determining if the received information satisfies a condition, determining if the received information satisfies a condition by comparing the received information to at least one condition, making an access control decision by applying a policy to the condition, establishing, by the session server, a connection between the client node and the one or more application sessions is subject to a rule permitting the client node to connect to the one or more application sessions, the identifying one or more application sessions is automatic upon receipt of authentication information. Wils does not disclose that the subscriber data that makes up the subscriber key is gathered using a collection agent. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the subscriber data of Wils to be gathered using a client-side script in order to provide resource access system that is accessible through a web browser as taught by Shrader (Col. 1, lines 16-49).

Referring to claims 2-3, Wils discloses that the request and the subscriber key are received over a network connection ([0026]), which meets the limitation of requesting the resource over a network connection, gathering the information over a network connection.

Referring to claims 4, 31-33, Wils does not disclose that the subscriber data that makes up the subscriber key is gathered using a client side script. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the subscriber data of Wils to be gathered using a client-side script in order to provide resource access system that is accessible through a web browser as taught by Shrader (Col. 1, lines 16-49).

Art Unit: 2432

Referring to claims 11, 38, 44, Wils discloses that after a period of time the system is requested to deactivate all sessions that have no more requests ([0074]-[0078]), which meets the limitation of receiving, by a session server, a disconnect request to disconnect a first application session associated with the user and a second application session associated with the user.

Referring to claims 12, 13, 20, 39, Wils discloses that once the sessions have been deactivated, the sessions are put on the inactive list ([0074]), which meets the limitation of updating, by the session server, at least one data record associated with the first and second application session to indicate that the first and second application sessions are disconnected, continuing, by the session server, execution of one or more applications for at least one of the disconnected application sessions, at least one application session is disconnected.

Referring to claims 18, 21, 23, 28, 42, 45, Wils discloses that an inactive session can be quickly reactivated if new requests are received under that session ([0023]), which meets the limitation of one or more application sessions was connected to a first client node prior to connection and, after connection, the one or more application sessions is reconnected to the first client node, at least one application session is active, providing for receiving application output from a one or more previously disconnected application sessions associated with the user in response to the received information, the one or more disconnected application sessions was connected to a first client node prior to disconnection and, at connection, the one or more disconnected application session is reconnected to the first client node.

Referring to claims 19, 29, 43, Wils discloses that grouped sessions can be allocated among active subscribers ([0039]), which meets the limitation of the one or more application sessions was associated with a first client node prior to establishing the connection and, after

Art Unit: 2432

establishing the connection, the one or more application sessions is connected to a second client node.

Referring to claim 24, Wils discloses that after a period of time the system is requested to deactivate all sessions that have no more requests ([0074]-[0078]), which meets the limitation of disconnecting at least one active application session associated with the user in response to the received information.

Referring to claim 26, Wils discloses that if the conditions for access to the open session are met, the subscriber is connected to the open session ([0030]-[0031]), which meets the limitation of the receipt of application output from the one or more active application sessions is subject to a rule permitting the user to have a client node operated by the user to connect to the one or more active application sessions.

7. Claims 8, 25, 35, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wils, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0004950, in view of Shrader, U.S. Patent No. 6,151,599, and further in view of Maung, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0073512. Referring to claims 8, 35, 41, Wils does not disclose that the active sessions include a session from one server and a session from a different server. Maung discloses a unique session storage system wherein a plurality of servers store session information for a particular user ([0011] & [0030]), which meets the limitation of a first one of the application sessions is running on a first server and a second one of the application sessions is running on a second server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the sessions of Wils to be belong to multiple servers in order to provide load balancing which would prevent a single server from being overloaded with session requests as taught by Maung ([0012]).

Art Unit: 2432

Referring to claim 25, Wils does not disclose the subscriber being able to access the sessions using two different client terminals. Maung discloses a user being able to access sessions using two different client terminals ([0011]), which meets the limitation of the one or more active application sessions is initially connected to a first client node, and upon requesting access to the resource, the user is operating a second client node. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was for the subscriber of Wils to be able to access sessions using two different client terminals so that the subscriber is not limited to interacting with the same computing device for an entire session.

8. Claims 10, 27, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wils, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0004950, in view of Shrader, U.S. Patent No. 6,151,599. Referring to claims 10, 27, 37, Wils does not explicitly disclose that the subscriber request was initiated by the selection of a single user interface element. However, the Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that is it well known and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the subscriber of Wils with a user interface to select the requested server in order to provide a user friendly means of operating the subscriber terminal.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2432

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN E. LANIER whose telephone number is (571)272-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Benjamin E Lanier/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2432